



Culture, Media and Sport Committee

House of Commons 7 Millbank London SW1P 3JA

Tel 020 7219 6188 Fax 020 7219 2031 Email cmscom@parliament.uk Website www.parliament.uk/cmscom

Tom Crone



29 July 2011

Dear Mr Crone,

I write with regard to oral evidence that you and Colin Myler gave to the Culture, Media and Sport Committee on 21 July 2009 in the context of the oral evidence that James Murdoch gave to the Committee of the same name on 19 July 2011.


In the July 2009 evidence session, Colin Myler told the Committee that the external investigation News International had commissioned had been "completely hands-off" (Q1384) and "very thorough" (Q1394). You assured the Committee that "no evidence was found" (Q1398) that anyone other than Goodman had been involved with Mulcaire. To assist you, I attach a copy of the transcript.

On Friday 8 April 2011, News International issued a statement in which it admitted that "is its now apparent that our previous inquiries failed to uncover important evidence and we acknowledge our actions then were not sufficiently robust". In the July 2011 evidence session, James Murdoch stated that when he signed off the out-of-court settlement for Gordon Taylor he was not aware of the contents of the "for Neville" email (Q 413).

According to media reports you have since disputed the account given by Mr Murdoch: "Just by way of clarification relating to Tuesday's Culture, Media Select Committee hearing, we would like to point out that James Murdoch's recollection of what he was told when agreeing to settle the Gordon Taylor litigation was mistaken. In fact, we did inform him of the 'for Neville' email which had been produced to us by Gordon Taylor's lawyers".¹

In light of these developments, the Committee invites you to reconsider the evidence, quoted above, that you provided in 2009. It also invites you to submit written evidence, providing more details about the areas in which you dispute James Murdoch's evidence. In particular, it would be helpful to know when and

¹ See, for example, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/media/2011/jul/21/james-murdoch-select-committee-evidence>



Culture, Media and Sport Committee

House of Commons 7 Millbank London SW1P 3JA

Tel 020 7219 6188 Fax 020 7219 2031 Email cmscom@parliament.uk Website www.parliament.uk/cmscom

Tom Crone

[REDACTED]

29 July 2011

Dear Mr Crone,

I write with regard to oral evidence that you and Colin Myler gave to the Culture, Media and Sport Committee on 21 July 2009 in the context of the oral evidence that James Murdoch gave to the Committee of the same name on 19 July 2011.

In the July 2009 evidence session, Colin Myler told the Committee that the external investigation News International had commissioned had been "completely hands-off" (Q1384) and "very thorough" (Q1394). You assured the Committee that "no evidence was found" (Q1398) that anyone other than Goodman had been involved with Mulcaire. To assist you, I attach a copy of the transcript.

On Friday 8 April 2011, News International issued a statement in which it admitted that "is its now apparent that our previous inquiries failed to uncover important evidence and we acknowledge our actions then were not sufficiently robust". In the July 2011 evidence session, James Murdoch stated that when he signed off the out-of-court settlement for Gordon Taylor he was not aware of the contents of the "for Neville" email (Q 413).

According to media reports you have since disputed the account given by Mr Murdoch: "Just by way of clarification relating to Tuesday's Culture, Media Select Committee hearing, we would like to point out that James Murdoch's recollection of what he was told when agreeing to settle the Gordon Taylor litigation was mistaken. In fact, we did inform him of the 'for Neville' email which had been produced to us by Gordon Taylor's lawyers".¹

In light of these developments, the Committee invites you to reconsider the evidence, quoted above, that you provided in 2009. It also invites you to submit written evidence, providing more details about the areas in which you dispute James Murdoch's evidence. In particular, it would be helpful to know when and

¹ See, for example, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/media/2011/jul/21/james-murdoch-select-committee-evidence>